

Waste Reduction Task Force

Public & Private Participation Work Group #2

March 20, 2008

Meeting Summary

Work Group Members Present: Charles Baines, Bulah Hines (a representative sent on behalf of Faye Dalton), Sharon Smith, Marty Turbeville

Guests Present: Dr. Richard Buggelin (UT Center for Industrial Services), Adriane Metcalfe (RMCT)

Facilitator: Paula Larson, TDEC

This meeting was held in Nashville, over lunch, at the Waste Reduction Task Force Meeting. The topics covered in this meeting further developed the second recommendation from the March 6th conference call and started forming a third recommendation. The second recommendation listed below was reviewed and agreed upon by all the group members present. The initial work on the third recommendation is also listed below. **Second Recommendation:**

Newly permitted facilities (Class I landfills, Class III/IV Construction and Demolition (C & D) landfills, transfer stations, and expansions of existing landfills) will be required to separate recyclable materials on the front-end of waste collection. This would be accomplished through curbside pickup, voluntary drop-off programs, and/or sorting and separating on-site.

This requirement of separating materials will be a part of the permit conditions. In order to receive a permit, there must be a plan for separation, sorting, and segregating materials written in the permit application.

Pros to implementation:

- Cost effective for counties if facility is not county-operated
- Provides reduction of waste going into landfills
- Revenues from recyclables could increase (increase quantity of recyclables generated)
- Requires accountability for private landfill companies to be a part of the solution for waste reduction
- Provides revenue for private landfill companies (Landfills can charge tipping fee as materials come across scales and then separate and sell commodities at market prices for additional revenue.)

- Encourages construction sector /developers on source separation and would in-turn decrease their landfill costs
- Ease of implementation at C & D landfills, as items of value (cardboard and metals) could be easily separated from the waste stream

Cons to implementation:

- Landfill owner conflict (possible increase in staff needed at landfills to sort and separate recyclables)
- Education of general public and landfill operators
- Need for additional landfill/facilities inspectors
- Tipping fees could increase, due to additional costs from a need for more staff at landfills
- Enforcement challenges
 - TDEC having 'teeth' to enforce non-compliance
 - Determining if fines, rejection of permit application, or other sanction options for non-compliance would be most effective

Resources Required:

- Staff increase at TDEC for landfill/facility inspectors
- Storage space and inventory room for recyclables needed at landfills/facilities
- Staff increase at landfills/facilities to sort out recyclables
- Funding for a large, statewide public education campaign

Cost Benefits:

- Save consumers money by extending the life of landfills, thus alleviating the need to build more landfills as often
- Revenue created by recyclables
- Better rates (lower tipping fees) for businesses or individuals coming into landfills/facilities with pre-sorted recyclables separate from the waste stream

Obstacles and Barriers:

- Communication in obtaining public support and understanding the greater issue of waste reduction

- Resistance to change
- Resistance by landfills operators

Implementation:

- New permits and permit modifications to include on-site separation of recyclable materials
- Statewide public education on the amount of landfill space left in Tennessee, values of recyclables (items that are thrown away have value), and solid waste issues.

Third Recommendation:

Specific waste streams including cardboard, electronic waste, aluminum, and metal would be banned from landfills from the private sector (industrial, institutional, commercial). Residential sector would then be phased in to participate in the landfill bans as well.

Pros of Implementation:

- Well-established markets are present for recyclable materials
- These commodities have value
- Convenient scrap metal drop-offs are already available and in place
- Small amount of metals are going into landfills currently, thus there would be ease of implementation

Cons of Implementation:

- When markets drop, there will be complaints
- Difficulty of implementation for the residential sector as it will be easier to have a separate dumpster for cardboard at a business

Next meeting:

The next meeting is on April 17th, 2008 in Nashville.